

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Discussion of Amendments*

The specification has been amended to replace the Attorney Docket No. with the Application No. of the corresponding patent application. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the cell protection factor is a compound of Formula IV. Claim 7 has been amended to change the claim dependency in view of the cancellation of claim 6. Claim 76 has been amended to delete the term "wherein the cell protection factor is a temporary inhibitor of a tumor suppressor gene" as the term is unnecessary since the cell protection factor is defined by a formula (Formula IV). A similar amendment was made to claim 77 also. Claims 81, 82, 90, 92, 100, and 104 have been amended to change the claim dependencies in view of the cancellation of claim 79. New claims 105-127 have been added and are directed to embodiments of the invention. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Dameron Jones for the courtesies extended to Xavier Pillai, one of Applicants' attorneys during the telephone interview held on November 16, 2007 to discuss the indefiniteness rejection of claims 12, 35, 36, 83, 85, and 96-99. While the rejection was discussed in general terms, no specific agreement was reached.

The Office Action

The specification has been objected to for an alleged informality. The Office Action rejects claims 12, 35, 36, 83, 85, and 96-99 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for an alleged indefiniteness.

The Office Action indicates that claims 76 and 77 are allowable over the prior art of record. The Office Action indicates that claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17-20, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 37, 75, 79, 80-82, 84, 86-95, and 100-104 (all claims in part) are allowable over the prior art of record. The Office Action also indicates that claims 1, 2, 12, 17-20, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 35-37, 79, 82, 83, 86, 87, 90, 92, 94, 96, 97, 100, 103, and 104 (all claims examined-in-part) are withdrawn from further consideration as non-elected invention.

Specification Objection

As applicants have amended the specification, the objection has been rendered moot. Accordingly, the specification objection should be removed.

Indefiniteness Rejection

Although Applicants disagree with the rejection of claims 12, 35, 36, 83, 85, and 96-99, Applicants have canceled these claims to expedite prosecution of the patent application, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, the indefiniteness rejection should be removed.

Allowable Claims

The Office Action has indicated the allowability of claims limited to the searched subject matter, i.e., independent claims reciting the compound of Formula IV and claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the independent claims to include a reference to the compound of Formula IV. Applicants have also added new dependent claims. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the all pending claims should be allowable.

Conclusion

A favorable decision is solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Xavier Pillai, Reg. No. 39,799
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: December 13, 2007